UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,698	11/20/2003	Joseph A. Pruitt	1000.4US01/10.83	9310
	7590 02/06/2007		EXAM	INER
Gary N. Mager F5 Networks, Inc.			VETTER, DANIEL	
Legal Departme 401 Elliot Ave.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		02/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			a d		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/717,698	PRUITT ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	Daniel P. Vetter	3628			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addr	ess		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communities (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
,	his action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde	·		nerits is		
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withden 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-67 are subject to restriction and/or	rawn from consideration.		i i		
Application Papers	·				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	·	• • •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2	- 2 2			
Attachment(s)	A) 🗖 1-4	Summan (DTO 442)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date]		
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of 6) Other:	Informal Patent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-67 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a method for accessing a service provided by one or more service providers, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
 - II. Claims 20-23 and 27-30, drawn to an apparatus for accessing a service, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
 - III. Claims 24-26, drawn to a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
 - IV. Claims 31-43 and 57-59, drawn to a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions and a method for providing access, via a service provider, to a service, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
 - V. Claims 44-50, drawn to a method for determining a service provider,
 classified in class 705, subclass 1.
 - VI. Claims 51-56 and 59-63, drawn to a method for providing access, via a service provider, to a service and a method for providing access to a service in a service provider, classified in class 705, subclass 1.

VII. Claim 67, drawn to a system for providing access to a service, classified in class 705, subclass 1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Invention VII is related to inventions I-VI as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination VII has separate utility such as storing feedback data that was received by a data collector in a repository. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

3. Invention III is related to inventions I-II and IV-VI as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination III has separate utility such as sharing feedback data among a plurality of clients. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

4. Invention VI is related to inventions I-II and IV-V as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination VI has

separate utility such as automatically modifying one of the attributes of a service. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

5. Invention IV is related to inventions I-II and V as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination IV has separate utility such as determining a second result set. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together.

Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the

allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

6. Invention V is related to inventions I-II as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination V has separate utility such as performing a transaction. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to

provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

- 7. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process of invention I can be performed without the assistance of an interface arranged to receive feedback data.
- 8. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel P. Vetter whose telephone number is (571) 270-1366. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Nolan can be reached on (571) 272-0847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HART FIEN S. GARTER 3600 PRIMARY EVANINER 3600 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600